

he was still sympathetic to New England's problems, even while exposed to the constant political badgering of coal spokesmen.

"President Johnson and Secretary Udall are to be commended," Couzens concluded, "for continuing to face facts objectively with regard to their administration of the oil import program, and by refusing to yield to the malicious personal attacks and misleading assertions of those who are working so hard and spending so much money to deceive their supporters, while keeping 50 million oil consumers—from Maine to Florida—in the economic shackles of artificial high fuel and power costs."

### MUST I KEEP SILENT?

During the delivery of Mr. THURMOND's speech,

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my steadily growing volume of mail approving my expressed belief that we should pull our men from the combat in which they are now engaged in South Vietnam and stop the needless sacrifice of American lives contains two items that should be read by Senators.

One is a letter which enclosed what I consider to be both a beautiful and a pertinent poem entitled "Must I Keep Silent?" written by Henri Percikow; the other is the leading editorial entitled "Can Khanh?" published in the current, March 28 issue of the New Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, poem, and editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
March 21, 1964.

HON. SENATOR GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to commend you for your courageous stand against U.S. intervention in Vietnam. I agree wholeheartedly with your position of bringing every American soldier home from Vietnam immediately and thereby saving the useless slaughter of American boys and of Vietnamese people.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing my poem, "Must I Keep Silent," and hope you may enjoy reading it.

Respectfully yours,

HENRI PERCIKOW.

P.S.—The enclosed poem was originally printed in the Hartford Times in Connecticut.

H.P.

### MUST I KEEP SILENT?

(By Henri Percikow)

Must I keep silent walking among young men

Who through the seasons have been driven  
On to Calvary to be crucified—  
For whom, for what?

How can I keep silent when treading on dew-drops

Among fields strewn with white crosses  
That tell of youth cut down  
Of stillborn dreams and faith dissolved—  
For whom, for what?

How can I stroll through lover's lane  
And be deaf to the whispering vows of love  
That ache to germinate life—  
For whom, for what?

How can I watch silently the unfledged  
That live dejected and brutalized,  
Prey for tomorrow's death—  
For whom, for what?

How can I remain silent  
When your children, my children  
Clustered on the tree of life  
May be gathered and consumed—  
For whom, for what?

### CAN KHANH?

Since the administration does not seem to be able to think of anything better to do in Vietnam, it has decided to do more of the same. At this point, the situation begins to resemble an old movie in which the camera speeds up the action to produce a ludicrous effect. Episodes follow one another so fast that it becomes necessary to recapitulate. Last November, no Nhus were good news, and all bets were on Big Minh; now however, with what in happier circumstances might be regarded as merely due recognition of French cultural influence, the question seems to be: can Khanh? If he can't, it won't be the fault of Washington. The White House last week announced that the United States will back up the new Vietnamese leader with substantial increases in economic aid, as well as additional military aid. But let no one think that such aid has been anything other than substantial in the past. In the last decade, this country has put nearly \$3 billion into Vietnam, two-thirds of it for economic assistance and almost all of it in the form of outright grants. That \$3 billion figure may take on more meaning if we are reminded that it is only a little less than half of the total of grants and loans made by the United States during the same decade to all of the 25 countries of Latin America.

There is a bit of irony in the satisfaction which the administration has officially expressed over General Khanh's new intention to put into effect a national mobilization plan that will provide conditions and terms of service in appropriate jobs for all able-bodied South Vietnamese between certain ages. If the same intention had been voiced by the Communists in the north, many an indignant column would be written in the American press about the evils of a police state.

At the end of January, some days after Secretary Rusk had announced that the then new measures of the South Vietnamese Government would bear good fruit, that Government was toppled by the regime of General Khanh. Toward the end of last month, the Secretary of State shot down with great dispatch a balloon sent aloft in a Presidential speech to the effect that it might be necessary to attack North Vietnam; Mr. Rusk said with unaccustomed bluntness that the problem was in South Vietnam, and that no miracle in the North could eliminate it. This month, Secretary McNamara and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have risked their lives in South Vietnam in order to put on a display of handshaking and head patting that was manifestly intended to bolster Khanh among his own people. One protecting helicopter crashed, killing two American soldiers on board. An eyewitness remarked that security broke down to the point where anyone could have put a grenade into Mr. McNamara's pocket. Mr. McNamara attempted to explain his and General Taylor's extraordinary mission by saying that we went in order to emphasize that Khanh has our full support. Alas, it is not the full support of the Americans that General Khanh needs so much as the full support of the South Vietnamese. And although Mr. McNamara sought to encourage and astonish peasants by shouting, "Vietnam, a thousand years," there may be yet another coup, and then another.

What does it all mean? A reasonable series of guesses would be that the dependence of the insurgents of South Vietnam on North Vietnam is still exaggerated; that they manage to live off the country and to fight mostly with arms that they capture from the Government forces; that therefore the bombing

of Hanoi or taking other military measures against the North might not have much immediate effect on the war in the South; that the risks of such action so clearly outweigh the possible gains and so rouse some of our allies, that Mr. Rusk felt obliged to turn aside from the idea; and that hoping against hope, the United States has decided to keep General Khanh propped up at almost any cost. In spite of Mr. McNamara's assurance of last November and again this January that American personnel could be withdrawn—at least by 1965—the American presence may in fact have to be enlarged. The U.S. commitment deepens month by month, with no end in sight for a war which Khanh himself admits is likely to continue for another decade or longer.

There is an alternative, though it might not be thought politically prudent to mention it aloud before the November election. It is the alternative suggested by a Republican newspaper editor and publisher, John S. Knight: "Recognize the impossibility of a military victory and negotiate for whatever political advantages can be found in a stalemate."

### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. GASTON DEFFERRE, DEPUTY-MAYOR OF MARSEILLES, FRANCE

During the delivery of Mr. THURMOND's speech,

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY], with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor and with the further understanding that with such yielding the continuance of my speech shall not constitute another speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his thoughtful consideration and courtesy in yielding to me at this time.

I asked the Senator from South Carolina to yield to me, so that I might make a brief announcement and introduction.

Today, the Senate is singularly honored by the visit of and the presence of a distinguished and noted member of the French Chamber of Deputies, as well as a distinguished public servant who has for 11 years been the mayor of Marseilles, France. In the Republic of France it is possible to be a municipal official as well as a national official.

I refer to Hon. Gaston Defferre.

Mr. Defferre has been the deputy mayor of Marseilles, France, for 11 years. He has served in that important capacity as mayor of that great city of almost a million people.

For 3 years he served as a senator of the French Republic. For 16 years he served as a deputy representing his district in the French Chamber of Deputies.

Mr. Gaston Defferre is visiting our country. Yesterday, he delivered a very fine address at the National Press Club. He has had a number of visits with members of the executive branch of the Government as well as members of the legislative branch. He is known as a distinguished European as well as a great and distinguished Frenchman. He is a friend of the United States. He is a great fighter for democracy and freedom.

He is also a candidate in the coming elections in France for the office of President.

I welcome him to the Senate, and we extend to him heartfelt and fraternal greetings. It is always good to welcome a distinguished citizen of France, because in the hearts of the American people France will always find a very special place of honor and affection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. We on the minority side join in welcoming M. Gaston Defferre, with whom I have just shared the privilege of discussion about the great matters affecting the Atlantic community at the so-called Bilderberg Conference in Williamsburg, Va., presided over by Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands. I had the honor to hear M. Defferre's views expressed at that conference.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, M. Defferre is a distinguished citizen of France, and an outstanding public official. What I heard about his views and his deep interest in the integrity and the integration of the Atlantic community made me understand the reason why he is held in such high esteem, and why he occupies a place of such distinction.

So I take great pleasure in joining all Senators on the Democratic side in welcoming Deputy Mayor Defferre to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by M. Defferre given at the luncheon of the National Press Club, on Monday, March 23, may be printed in the RECORD, because it states so clearly the views of our distinguished friend, and I wish to have the privilege of sharing them with all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. GASTON DEFFERRE, DEPUTY MAYOR OF MARSEILLES, AT THE LUNCH OF THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, ON MARCH 23, 1964

I do not see eye to eye with General de Gaulle on relations between France and the United States—that much I think you already know. I would not have crossed the Atlantic and taken any of your time for that declaration.

But my conflict of views with the present French President does not at all mean that France, or any of our European countries, should be subordinated to the United States; I have come here to make it very clear. I have come to discuss it as a friend, but with frankness with the American officials, and I shall have the great pleasure and the honor to talk with President Lyndon Johnson tomorrow. I also came to discuss it with you.

The time is now past when two great nations, two superpowers, two blocs, could dominate the world. In a few years we shall find it indeed surprising that we were not more clearly aware of this fact in 1964.

France and Europe are now economically strong enough to find unacceptable any form of tutelage or domination. In your own history you have experienced this situation and this state of mind. I am sure you will understand how we feel.

National self-respect is a natural feeling. It is healthy that this feeling should exist. It is normal that it should be expressed.

What is unhealthy is the way in which it is now being exploited in France, both internally and externally, to justify certain policies.

It is possible to create a genuinely united Europe which will transcend present nationalist feelings, and it is possible to establish good relations between such a Europe and the United States—a true partnership. But to do so, we shall have to meet a number of conditions. Of these I came here to speak.

1. Frenchmen must not have the impression that the United States wants to keep them in a state of dependency.

2. Therefore we must agree on the objectives to be attained: equality of rights and the consequences deriving therefrom.

3. The method to be employed is that of frankness. We must not be afraid to admit that in some important cases our interests are not, at present, the same; and we must say so. But we must do it with the intention of finding solutions and it must be well understood that no one can impose his own point of view.

The most actual problem is not in the field of our military alliance; it lies in economic competition between the United States and Europe.

This problem must be stated in clear, objective terms.

It must not be obscured by the spectacular actions of any chief of state, nor by his desire to annoy his allies, nor by the reactions that this policy might provoke. For such reactions, however justified they may seem, are no more realistic than the actions which provoke your irritation.

Behind appearances we must try to look at the economic and industrial realities.

It is true that Europe's rate of economic growth in recent years has been perceptibly greater than that of the United States. The yearly average growth of the European Economic Community is 5.6 percent. That of the United States is 3.3 percent.

It is also true that American monetary reserves have diminished. From 1950 to 1960 they dropped from \$22.8 to \$17.8 billion; whereas in the same period the European Economic Community's reserves rose from \$3.1 to \$15.1 billion. This dollar drain is a source of worry for the American Government and the American people. We understand that.

Now, many Americans believe that this weakening of the U.S. external balance is mainly due to Europe's increasing competition, and to its being increasingly shut off from the currents of trade, notably American trade. But reality is different. It is a main point, and one usually much obscured by vague and passionate controversy. And that point I would like, if I may, to analyze rapidly.

First of all you are still very much stronger, in absolute terms and in comparison to us, than you think. The industrial strength of Europe remains far behind that of the United States.

The national product per capita in the United States is still about three times greater than in Europe.

Also American corporations have production capacity and financial possibilities far superior to those of, for example, French corporations. And this fact entails even more serious consequences in the future, since very large companies are better equipped obviously to finance scientific research and further progress.

I shall mention only one example, that of the General Motors Corp. The gross income of General Motors is the equivalent of the whole national budget of France. General Motors' profits alone are as great as the gross income of our largest automobile company, the Renault Works.

You are today very much stronger, especially in comparison to us, than would

appear from the surface difficulties of your balance of payments.

What are the real reasons for the dollar drain, that is a primary concern to the American Government, and rightly so?

This balance-of-payments deficit does not result solely from foreign aid spending. It results also, and even more so, from the investing of private capital abroad by American citizens and business firms.

The current trade balance of the United States for 1962 was favorable to the extent of \$3.6 billion.

The special charges borne by the United States because of its civil and military spending abroad, amount to \$3.5 billion.

Thus there is equilibrium, and even a slight surplus, if we compare the current trade balance and foreign aid spending of all kinds.

But the outflow of private capital amounts to \$2.5 billion, consisting of investments outside the United States.

So the general deficit in the American balance of payments is \$2.2 billion, that is to say, a little less than the outflow of private capital.

Two points must be added:

1. Investments of American capital abroad will in future yield revenue which, reentering the United States, will improve the American balance of payments, and will impair the balance of payments of the countries where the capital is invested. We shall see in the future—and perhaps sooner than we think—a reversal of the present tendency in favor of the United States.

2. Also the deficit in the balance of payments is far greater than the actual gold drain on the United States. Why? Essentially because the European countries are willing to hold considerable quantities of dollars, which they do not try to convert.

My next point is this: the trend of commercial exchanges between Europe and the United States is not at all due to Europe's enjoying higher rate protection than the United States. The very opposite is true.

Contrary to a widely held opinion, Europe is rather weakly protected by tariffs. The average tariff barrier is 18 percent for U.S. tariffs and 12 percent for European tariffs.

The illustration and consequence of this we find in the rapid growth of imports in Europe in the last 5 years.

Growth of imports from 1953 to 1962:

European Community: \$16,156 million to \$22,327 million—plus 38 percent.

United States: \$13,208 million to \$16,240 million—plus 23 percent.

Growth of agricultural imports into the EEC: \$4,020 million to \$4,973 million—plus 24 percent.

Thus the accusation of autarchy has no basis. Europe depends greatly on world trade. It has contributed more than anyone else to the development of this trade in recent years. This is so true that today the Community must worry about reducing a commercial deficit that has reached alarming proportions, notably with regard to the United States.

Having made these few observations, we must draw conclusions, and make some political proposals.

America and Europe must become aware that they are facing the problem of what John Kennedy called the New Frontier. The important frontier no longer cuts through any continent, nor does it separate Europe and North America, the two most powerful continents, from the rest of the world. Instead, it cuts between the rich countries and the poor countries. The rich countries must settle their mutual problems among themselves in order to stand together in facing the challenge of this New Frontier.

To keep pace with the rapid evolution of scientific and technological progress, and with the expansion of the world's population,